

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application.

Claims 5-7, 18-20 and 26-28 are objected to.

Claims 1-4, 8-17, 21-25 and 29 are rejected.

The office action dated June 22, 2007 indicates that claim 13 is rejected under 35 USC §101 for reciting nonstatutory subject matter. The '101 rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 13.

The office action indicates that claims 1-4, 8-17, 21-25 and 29 are rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Huang et al. However, the office action indicates that dependent claims 5, 18 and 26 contain allowable subject matter because "[t]he art of record does not teach nor does it suggest the specific features called for in the claims, in particular the concept of training a neural network by analyzing the errors in a neighborhood as opposed to the traditional mention of training based on the error at a pixel location."

Claim 1 has been rewritten in independent form to include the subject matter that is considered allowable. Dependent claim 3 has been cancelled, claims 4 and 7-9 have been amended to depend from claim 1, and claim 5 has been amended to depend properly from amended claim 1. Claims 2 and 10 have been amended to further limit claim 9. Amended claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-12 should be allowable over the documents made of record.

Similarly, claim 15 has been amended to include the subject matter that is considered allowable. Dependent claim 16 has been amended to recite coding on input and output data of the neural network. Claims 17-18 and 20-21 have also been amended. Amended claim 15 and its dependent claims 16-21 should now be allowable over the documents made of record.

Similarly, claim 23 has been amended to include the subject matter that is considered allowable. Dependent claim 24 has been amended to recite coding on input and output data of the neural network. Claims 25-26 and 28 have also been amended. Amended claim 23 and its dependent claims 24-29 should now be allowable over the documents made of record.

The office action indicates that claims 7, 20 and 28 are rejected under 35 USC §112 because these claims recite non-gradient methods, but depend from claims (claims 5, 18 and 26) that recite the use of gradients. The '112 rejection has been rendered moot by the amendments above.

Claims 14 and 22 have also been cancelled.

The examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of the claims. The examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to discuss any issues that might remain.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hugh Gortler #33,890/
Hugh P. Gortler
Reg. No. 33,890

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

(949) 454-0898

Date: Oct. 15, 2007